THE
Dan Smoot Report

Vol. 15, No. 13 (Broadcast 710) March 31, 1969 Dallas, Texas

DAN SMOOT

Contributing To The Delinquency Of Minors

Professional sexologists promoting universal sex education in American public schools admit that such education will not reduce sexual promiscuity among youth, or even reduce such harmful consequences of promiscuity as illegitimacies, abortions, venereal diseases. In fact, the kind of sex education being promoted by SIECUS (Sex Information and Education Council of the U.S.), other organizations, and the federal government, leads not only to increased sexual promiscuity and all its attendant evils, but to total debauchery of youth.[1]

Why, then, is sex education in schools being strenuously, even frantically, promoted throughout the nation? What does SIECUS really hope to accomplish? Or, at least, what do SIECUS officials *say* they hope to accomplish? They say many things.

In the October, 1968, issue of *SIECUS Newsletter*, Dr. Mary Calderone, founder and executive director of SIECUS, says:

"The purpose of sex education is . . . engagement of the individual, whatever his age, in a process by which, while acquiring a fund of basic knowledge, he may also be helped to develop at least the beginnings of insights and attitude changes that might enable him to make sound, rational decisions regarding the use that he will make of that knowledge, whether professionally or in his personal life."

In a speech to the State Convention of the Texas PTA on November 21, 1968, Dr. Calderone said:

"The concept of sexuality as the totality of expression of the individual's entire self as male or female is, I believe, the essence of the purpose for which SIECUS was established. . . . As a 10th grade boy put it, 'There's more to sex than just doing it.'"

On its official stationery, SIECUS says its aim is "to establish for all responsible elements in our society an understanding of the basic role of sex in interpersonal relationships, that is, the personal and

THE DAN SMOOT REPORT is published weekly by The Dan Smoot Report, Inc., Box 9538, Dallas, Texas 75214 (office at 6441 Gaston Ave.). Subscriptions: $18.00 for 2 years; $10.00, 1 year; $6.00, 6 months. Dan Smoot was born in Missouri, reared in Texas. With BA and MA degrees from SMU (1938 and 1940), he joined the Harvard faculty (1941) as a Teaching Fellow, doing graduate work in American civilization. From 1942 to 1951, he was an FBI agent; from 1951 to 1955, a commentator on national radio and television. In 1955, he started his present independent, free-enterprise business: publishing this REPORT and abbreviating it each week for radio and TV broadcasts available for commercial sponsorship by business firms.

Copyright by Dan Smoot, 1969. Second Class mail privilege authorized at Dallas, Texas.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

social significance of human sexuality."

In a fund-raising letter, dated January 26, 1968, and signed by Dr. Paul Dudley White (who was President Eisenhower's heart specialist), the SIECUS goal is said to be "to establish man's sexuality as a health entity."

Dr. White also cites the "legacies of sexual ignorance" — high divorce rates and climbing teenage delinquency — as reason for the existence of SIECUS.

The March 8, 1966, issue of *Look* says the purpose of SIECUS is to bring "a new standard of maturity to American attitudes on sex." But the individuals whom Dr. Calderone and her organization try to transform into maturity about sex are adolescents (or even younger children) who cannot, and should not, have a mature attitude about anything — particularly, about the most mysterious, powerful, and delicately personal driving force in the material life of a human being.

In the November, 1966, issue of *American Education*, Dr. Calderone says:

"Factual knowledge is important [in sex education], of course, but not nearly so important as attitudes."

Here, perhaps, Dr. Calderone gets close to stating the real purpose of SIECUS — to inculcate *attitudes* about sex. Her own attitude is somewhat revealed in a 90-minute lecture she gave to 320 adolescent boys at Blair Academy, a prep school in New Jersey. Here are some of her remarks to the students, as reported in the March 8, 1966, issue of *Look*:

"What is sex for? It's for fun, that I know, for wonderful sensations. . . . Sex is not something to be feared or degraded or kicked around or used. Sex is not something you turn off like a faucet. If you do, it's unhealthy. We are sexual beings, legitimately so, at every age. Don't think that sex stops at the age of 50. It doesn't.

"We need new values to establish when and how we should have sexual experiences. Nobody's standing on a platform, giving answers. You are moving beyond your parents. But you can't just move economically or educationally. You must move sexually, as well. You must learn how to use sex. This is it: first, to separate yourselves from your parents; second, to establish a male or female role; third, to determine value systems; fourth, to establish your vocational role. Our sex expresses itself in everything we do.

"Sex is not just something you do in marriage, in bed, in the dark, in one position."

Dr. Calderone ended her formal lecture with that remark. As she sat down, Headmaster James Howard led the boys of Blair Academy in a sustained standing ovation.

In a question-and-answer session following the lecture, one boy asked:

"What is your opinion of premarital sex relations among teenagers?"

Dr. Calderone replied by demanding:

"What's yours?"

That evoked a roar of laughter. When it subsided, Dr. Calderone added:

"Nobody from up on high determines this. You determine it."

Dr. Calderone chided the boys about their double standard, saying:

"You're perfectly willing to make somebody else's sister, but you're not willing to let someone make your sister. Why? Why are you trying to stop your sister from what you believe is lovely and beautiful?"

At an informal meeting attended only by student seniors, Dr. Calderone and the Blair boys discussed the question of whether girls usually get through high school without being seduced. One Blair senior seemed to think few do. He said:

"We knock 'em over pretty easy."

In a letter to Dr. Calderone, Chaplain Foster Doan said:

"Rarely, if ever, has anything as exciting as your visit happened at Blair. Even before you left, the campus had exploded into some violent arguments."

Doan is a member of the board of directors of SIECUS.

Lester Kirkendall, another SIECUS board member, says sex education in schools is necessary, because:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"The school, far better than the home, can prepare young people for the wide range in attitudes about sex they will meet."

This is an unsupported assumption; but, even if accurate, it does not explain the necessity, or even advisability, of exposing school children to a "wide range in attitudes about sex."

Eventually (without the expenditure of tax money and time in schools), they will probably encounter a "wide range in attitudes about sex" — and the later in their lives the better. The older they are the more likely they are to be "prepared" for the encounter. The best preparation is not some pedagogical effort in school to create understanding of aberrant sex attitudes, but an exposure in childhood to the attitude generally accepted in our culture — the attitude that is based on God's law, or on society's moral codes which derive from God's law.

Kirkendall says:

"A sex education program for young people . . . should present contrasting views on such issues as early marriage, divorce, abortion, family planning, pornography, homosexuality, population control, and the control of venereal disease."[2]

The "view" of normal people in our society is that pornography and homosexuality are reprehensible. The *contrasting view* must, by definition, be the opposite view: namely, that pornography and homosexuality are laudable. What purpose can be served by presenting this view to young people, especially in school where most youngsters think the views presented are the ones society condones?

Kirkendall and other SIECUS officials say one of their purposes is to mitigate the exploitation of sex, especially commercial. Yet, as pointed out in previous issues of this *Report*, SIECUS is involved in promoting a multi-million dollar exploitation of sex among the nation's school children. Kirkendall openly justifies commercial exploitation of sex when he and his fellow sexologists do the exploiting. For example, Kirkendall and other SIECUS board members are board members of *Sexology*, a salacious magazine. Kirkendall is also an editor of *Sexology*. He says it is all right for *Sexology* to feature lurid pictures and titles on its cover because this is the only way to attract buyers who, not being good readers, would not otherwise notice the magazine.[3]

Actually, the SIECUS sexologists who are pushing pornography into the classrooms do infinitely more harm to children than is done by sleazy characters who hang out on the fringes of school yards to sell filthy pictures to kids.

Some parents approve, or accept, the teaching of obscenity in classrooms because "if the children don't learn it there, they will learn it in the gutter." Very well, let them learn it in the gutter. They will then know it is gutter talk, not fit to be used around respectable people; and most of them will develop a properly contemptuous attitude toward it — as young people have always been doing.

Graphic aids now being used in many schools include life-size models, or close-up pictures, of human sexual organs—often depicted in their condition and position during coition. Showing such material to mixed classes of small boys and girls must create in most or all of them powerful emotions — of excitement, embarrassment, disgust, or fear.

Details about copulation, conception, and birth are not facts of life to small children, but information about adult behavior which they cannot comprehend or consider unemotionally. Most child psychoanalysts advise against such treatment of small children.[4]

Giving sex education to mixed classes of adolescent boys and girls, on the assumption that they will react matter-of-factly and unemotionally, is tantamount to expecting in youngsters a detached, professional attitude about sexual parts of the body — an attitude that doctors and nurses acquire only through years of living, education, training, and experience. This is not a normal or healthy attitude for children to have, even if it could be inculcated into them, as it cannot be.

Why try to *push* adolescents into adult behavior before they can possibly be ready for it? It is profoundly important to let children be children, until they *grow* into adulthood.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Much of the creative energy which built western civilization was acquired and stored by the very young, absorbing knowledge and receiving training *before* the troubled period of sexual awakening. The kind of sex education now being thrust upon many children in schools cannot fail to arouse the sleeping giant within them — long before they are psychologically, emotionally, or intellectually prepared to cope with it; long before they have acquired enough information and orientation to develop interest in pursuits that would make possible the sublimation of part of the sex drive into other activities.

Not all children are ready for the same sex education at the same time, but that is the way they get it in school. Giving a child sex education that he is not ready for is far more damaging to him than giving him none at all.

Some parents currently opposing sex education in elementary schools approve it for high schools. Yet, indiscriminate sex education in high schools can be as harmful as in grade schools.

Bring teenage boys and girls together to discuss the function of human sexual organs; see drawings, photographs, and models of them; view pictures depicting the act of copulation? Some will be repulsed and will develop the same attitude of shame and revulsion about sex that prudish victorianism is accused of having caused in a previous generation. Others who are less sensitive will be over-excited into dangerous preoccupation with sex. It is at the senior high school age when the sex drive, especially in boys, is most powerful — and dangerous. This is precisely the time of life when the attention of youngsters should be diverted as much as possible from sex, and channeled into study, sports, the arts, hobbies, gainful employment.

Every teacher involved in the SIECUS type of sex education in schools is literally contributing to the delinquency of minors, in violation of law. The violations of God's laws and of society's moral codes, resulting from this classroom encouragement of licentiousness, will eventually destroy the family as a basic unit of social organization and bring about the collapse of our civilization.

And there are other immeasurable, but immensely important, considerations. Discussing a girl's menstrual problems in the presence of boys is an appalling invasion of her privacy. Displaying contraceptive devices to coeducational groups of youngsters is shockingly indelicate.

The SIECUS type of sex education in schools strips sex of exquisite mystery, romance, beauty, delicacy, civilized sensitivity — leaving ugliness or prurience, encouraging permissiveness about something that needs powerful controls.

NEXT WEEK: this series on sex education will conclude with some suggestions for action.

* * * * *

NOTICE (in reply to many inquiries): Though we still have some 1963, 1964, 1965, and 1966 Bound Volumes for sale at the special price of $3.00 each — a sale made necessary by the need for working space — we cannot sell the 1967 and 1968 volumes at that below-cost figure, but must charge the regular price of $10.00 each. Our supply of the 1967 and 1968 volumes is quite limited.

SUBSCRIBE TO THE DAN SMOOT REPORT:
6 mos. — $6.00; 1 yr. — $10.00; 2 yrs. — $18.00

FOOTNOTES

(1) "Debauching Our Children" and "The Lust For More In Sex Education," *The Dan Smoot Report*, March 10 & 24, 1969, pp. 37-40, 45-8

(2) "Some Practical Suggestions For The School Starting A Sex Education Program," by Lester A. Kirkendall and Helen M. Cox, *Children*, July-Aug., 1967

(3) "School Sexology Plans Charted at Hush-Hush Session," *Anaheim Bulletin*, Dec. 18, 1968

(4) "Sex Invades The Schoolhouse," by John Kobler, *Saturday Evening Post*, June 29, 1968

REPRINTS OF THIS ISSUE
(for bulk mailing to one address):

1 copy	$ .25	100 copies	$ 6.50
10 copies	1.00	200 copies	12.00
25 copies	2.00	500 copies	28.00
50 copies	3.50	1000 copies	50.00

Texans Add 4% for Sales Tax
(Add 50¢ for special-handling postage)
THE DAN SMOOT REPORT TAylor 1-2303
BOX 9538 DALLAS, TEXAS 75214

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED